

# EXHIBIT H

## Record of Investigation

For Ta Zi No. 6099 case of violation against secrets act of the Republic of China in 2016, the interrogation was carried out at No. 15 Investigation Room of Taiwan Taichung District Prosecutors Office at 7 p.m. on February 15, 2016. The staffs present were as follows:

Prosecutor: CHEN Li-Wei Clerk: YEN Chun Hsiu

The attendees were as follows:

Called the interrogated person to appear in court

The prosecutor inquired about the name, age, address and national ID card number

The defendant replied correspondingly

RONG Le-tien, male, 53 years old, born on September 19, 1963

National ID card number: H121305464

Address: 8/F, 50 Dashun Rd, Xinshi District, Tainan City

Contact no.: 0952-234696, 0975-61260

The defender replied correspondingly

Lawyer CHEN Che-Hung

The defender replied correspondingly

Lawyer LIU Chia-Kun

The prosecutor informed the defendant of the following matters:

1. The criminal suspect and its accusation was violation of the Trade Secrets Act.
2. The defendant may remain silent and does not have to make a statement against his own will.
3. The defendant has the right to a defense counsel before being questioned. The defendant has the right to request for the legal aid if he is a low-income household, low-middle-income household, aboriginal or meets other laws and decrees.
4. The defendant has the right to request an investigation of evidence favorable to his case.

Q: On February 14, 2017, the investigator under the direction of the prosecutor of our Office performed a search in the United Microelectronics Corporation (UMC). After that, did the investigator present a notice to urge you to Tainan Investigation Bureau for investigation?

A: Yes.

Q: Were your statements at the Investigation Bureau based on your own free will?

A: Yes.

Q: Did the investigator inquire in an improper way?

A: No.

Q: After inquiry, did the investigator produce summon of our Office and request you to come to our Office for questioning by the prosecutor?

A: Yes.

Q: The investigator had detained two IPHONES in your PM2 office. Are these phones your own or allotted by UMC?

A: The big IPHONE6 was allotted by UMC, and the small IPHONE was purchased by myself.

Q: Does the above-mentioned two IPHONES have Internet access?

A: Yes.

Q: Can you access the UMC system by the above-mentioned two IPHONES?

A: Only available with the IPHONE6 allotted by UMC.

Q: Is it necessary to enter an account number and password to access the UMC system by the phone?

A: With the phone, I can only read the E-mail system of UMC and the attached files therein, but I cannot read the files in the UMC system.

Q: Is there any electronic file about DRAM Design Rule of UMC stored in the IPHONE allotted by UMC?

A: If I read emails by the IPHONE and someone sends me a file about the Design Rule which I read by the IPHONE, the file will be downloaded to the IPHONE, so I'm not sure about it. Private phones cannot access the email system of UMC.

Q: Did you contact WANG Yong-ming and HO Chien-ting by the private phone, including general calls, LINE and other communication software?

A: I'd not contacted them by my private phone. As for LINE, we'd established a manager chat group named PROJECT M before the Lunar New Year, which included all managers of PM2. We'd contacted each other through the chat group for any matter occurring during the Lunar New Year.

Q: Is the No. 2A-2 distress (hard disk) owned by UMC?

A: Yes.

Q: Is the DRAM Design Rule file of UMC stored on the hard disk?

A: Who is the owner of No. 2A-3 distress?

A: UMC.

Q: Is the DRAM Design Rule file of UMC stored in the USB flash drive?

A: No.

Q: What kind of files is stored in the USB flash drive and what are they used for?

A: I hadn't used it for a long time. I think the OFFICE installation software is stored in it.

Q: Is the No. 2A-4 distress (removable hard disk) also allotted by UMC?

A: It is the electronic file of the reverse engineering report purchased by UMC from TECHINSIGHTS. The electronic file contains the reverse engineering report on the line design of Samsung LPDDR4 3Gb.

Q: Who is the owner of the No. 2A-5-1 distress (one notebook)?

A: Me.

Q: What kind of data is recorded in the notebook?

A: They are mainly notes made during meetings.

Q: Is there any data related to the Design Rule recorded?

A: Probably.

Q: Who does the No. 2A-5-2 distress (one notebook) belong to?

A: Me. They are also notes made during meetings. It might contain a few (if any) record on the Design Rule data.

Q: What kind of data is included in No. 2A-6-1 distress and No. 2A-6-2 distress?

A: That's the data found on my desk. It's very miscellaneous and I'm not sure about its kind. They are many recruitment resumes, in my memory.

Q: Who does the No. 2A-7 distress (one copy of Confidentiality Agreement) belong to and what is its use?

A: It was sent to me by the HR Department after I joined UMC.

Q: Who owns the No. 2A-8 distress (one ACER notebook computer)?

A: UMC allotted it to me for use at work.

Q: Can the notebook computer be connected to the UMC system to read the Design Rule file?

A: Yes, it can.

Q: Is there any Design Rule file in the notebook computer?

A: There should be.

Q: Who owns the No. 2A-9 distress (one seating plan)?

A: It was printed out by the secretary according to the instructions of the investigator. I didn't have it myself.

Q: The aforementioned articles are not formally related to this case, so the prosecutor has ordered the investigator to return them. Do you understand?

A: Yes.

Q: The evidences involved in this case are complicated and the questioning will take a long time. Is it necessary to arrange for your rest?

A: No, the investigation is expected to be ended as soon as possible.

Q: And, did you voluntarily agree to allow the investigator have a search at your residence?

A: Yes.

Q: Did you decide at your free will, or did the investigator force you to agree?

A: The investigator showed me a search warrant, indicating that it was also necessary to search for my car, which was driven by my wife, so we came back to my house. After returning home, the investigator asked if he could drop in and have a search. I replied that there was no problem.

Q: The investigator had checked and detained one HTC phone in your house. Is it yours?

A: Yes, the phone has been phased out by me and can only be connected to the WIFI network in my house. There is no SIM card inside.

Q: Is there any electromagnetic record related to the Design Rule in it?

A: There are not.

Q: During today's interrogation by the prosecutor, HO Chien-ting confessed that when the prosecutor of our Office conducted the first search at UMC on February 7, 2017, he was informed by you that the prosecutor would come and was asked whether there was something to be careful about. Then, HO Chien-ting picked up certain articles from his desk and inquired about where to store them, and finally handed them over to Assistant Engineer HUANG Shu-han. Is there anything wrong?

A: Here's what happened that day: I got a call from the HR Department in my seat that an investigation team was going to investigate WANG Yong-ming. I left my office and reached the seat of WANG Yong-ming. According to my memory, I asked him, "Do you have any data from the former company?" WANG Yong-ming replied, "There is no paper version, but there is some data in my computer." I was very angry and said, "Why is there still data, why hasn't it been deleted?" Then I went back to my office, during which I saw WANG Yong-ming was operating his computer. Because HO Chien-ting's seat is very close to that of WANG Yong-ming, which is about less than 1 meter away, I'm not sure if I'd told him it personally. As for the articles delivered by Ho Chien-ting to HUANG Shu-han, I didn't know until being told by the lawyer appointed by HUANG Shu-han on the second day.

041

Q: Have you given any instruction to WANG Yong-ming to remove the data from his former company?

A: I was surprised and replied "Why is there still data?"

Q: Since you know that the investigator was going to investigate WANG Yong-ming, but you inform him and allow him have the opportunity to annihilate and conceal the evidences. What is your purpose in doing that?

A: This was a very intuitive response at that time. Actually, managers and the HR Department have repeatedly stressed that no hardware or software from any other company can be brought to UMC. And I also don't know exactly what to search for and for what reason. I asked whether WANG Yong-ming had any data from the former company by the light of nature.

Q: Since you claim that you don't know what cause of action the investigator searched for, why did you intuitively ask WANG Yong-ming whether he had any data from the former company?

A: I think because it's something we've stressed over and over again, and the first thing that struck me is the data from the former company.

Q: If you trust the various measures of UMC that they could avoid staffs bring documents or files to UMC from their former companies, should there be no such reaction at the moment, is that true?

A: In fact, those measures are untrustworthy, so we are reminded repeatedly about it.

Q: Apart from WANG Yong-ming and HO Chien-ting, who are known to have delivered the computer equipment and files containing Micron's data to Assistant Engineer HUANG Shu-han of your company, were there any other staff that concealed the relevant articles on that day, such as LI Fu-che?

A: I don't know if LI Fu-che or any other staff has concealed the relevant articles.

Q: As a manager, you ought to cooperate with the investigation conducted by the prosecutor, but you unexpectedly informed the respondents of the prosecutor's investigation before the search. It serves to show that you should know subjectively that WANG Yong-ming or HO Chien-ting has relevant data about his former company. What do you think of the prosecutor's assertions?

A: I really don't know. I was surprised that WANG Yong-ming's statement that he had relevant data.

045

Q: According to the articles delivered by HUANG Shu-han afterwards, the files HO Chien-ting asked HUANG Shu-han to keep at that time even contained one copy of the business plan of Elpida, which is not your company's file at first sight. As head of PM2 Department, why don't you know about it?

A: No matter what they put on the desk, we won't have a check. On the morning of February 8, 2017, the lawyer (Lawyer Hong) appointed by HUANG Shu-han came to the company and told me about it. According to the lawyer, HUANG Shu-han told her on the way back from Taichung that she had taken some articles away from HO Chien-ting. I immediately called the general counsel in front of Lawyer Hong, and we talked on the phone about putting the articles in a safe place right away. Lawyer Hong said that HUANG Shu-han was on her way to the company. I met HUANG Shu-han in the lobby, followed her to her seat and moved the box of articles to my office. The general counsel advised me on the phone not to check what was inside the box. So the prosecutor just said that there was a business plan of Elpida, and I just knew that until then. As for the daily scope of work of staffs and control measures to be taken, I think we really have to do some research as managers.

Q: At present, UMC has cooperated with JHICC in Mainland China to entrust the research and development of 32-nanometer wafer technology with your company, and when the technology gets mature, it will be handed over to JHICC for mass production. Is that true?

A: Yes.

Q: The Design Rule shall be formulated beforehand for this research and development case. Is it the responsibility of the department managed by WEI Ming-te of your company?

A: Yes.

Q: Does your company take security measures for the Design Rule, so that it is only available for the specific departments?

A: It is available for all the departments of the new business division. I am not very clear about the scope and details of the control. The file is stored in the UMC system and is probably not encrypted, and may be controlled by means of permission.

Q: Should the Design Rule be regarded as a business secret (with secrecy, economy and confidentiality measures) in all semiconductor companies?

A: Yes, I believe it should be kept secret.

Q: On February 7, 2017, WANG Yong-ming confessed to the investigator that the data titled "DR25nmS Design Rule" in the "No. C-1-2 distress, name of distress: data of WANG Yong-ming" is a business secret of Micron (No. EES-2012000026-013) and is owned by Micron. In July and August 2016, he downloaded and printed the confidential business data of Micron in his previous backup in Google Drive under the instructions of RONG Le-tien. What's your opinion on the confession of WANG Yong-ming?

A: I didn't know that he had this file in his dormitory, I didn't instruct him and I didn't even know he had a GOOGLE Drive and his GOOGLE Drive contained the data of Micron, let alone instructing him to download the confidential data.

Q: On February 7, 2017, WANG Yong-ming confessed to the investigator that "In July and August 2016, RONG Le-tien told me that the new business division of UMC was developing the DRAM of F32 and it was necessary to formulate the Design Rule. He also knew that I had the DRAM Design Rules of Micron. Therefore, in order to quickly establish the Design Rule, he asked me to think of some way to provide the DRAM Design Rule of Micron or Elpida for his reference. Then, I downloaded Elpida's DRAM Design Rule and printed it out from the confidential business data backed up in Google Drive. After referring to this data in part, I filled in several groups of width and space figures that I thought feasible on more than ten sheets of UMC's Design Rule. With reverse engineering, it should be possible to confirm that these figures are derived from the Design Rule of Elpida." What's your opinion on the confession of WANG Yong-ming?

A: This statement was told to me by the investigator this morning. For this part, the investigator asked me a lot of questions. I recall that our whole department was discussing how to proceed with the Design Rule during the period from July to September 2016. I might have asked the department staffs for their opinions about it at the meeting, especially experienced staffs. WANG Yong-ming had worked with Rexchip or Micron for many years before, and had rich experience in DRMM, so I asked him for his relevant opinions. Later, he did print several pages of Design Rule of UMC, which had several handwritten figures on it. I presented these pages to WEI Ming-te and asked him to discuss with WANG Yong-ming again.

Q: How many handwritten figures did WANG Yong-ming fill in?

A: I really can't remember, at most a dozen of figures.

Q: Why could WANG Yong-ming directly modify the figures of the Design Rule of UMC without any verification, and you also think it is feasible?

A: During the discussion with my subordinates, I encouraged them to provide as much advice as possible. I also encouraged WEI Ming-te, WANG Yong-ming or other people who have opinions to make decisions together. With regard to the Design Rule, I recall that a Japanese staff in my department, Takahiro Nagai, also provided a lot of valuable advice.

Q: With your long working hours in the semiconductor industry, can the average person provide the correct Design Rule parameters only by memory when the reference files or data are not available?



A: For the parameters of the Design Rule, the capabilities of the process should be determined experimentally. As for the final decisions on these parameters, some inferences can be made from our knowledge of components and basic process principles, and some appropriate estimates of these parameters can be made according to our accumulated experience in the past. The process parameters are not derived from books or direct comparison.

Q: Why did you think the parameters handwritten by WANG Yong-ming were feasible, and then asked WEI Ming-te to discuss them with WANG Yong-ming?

A: I didn't think they were feasible, so I asked WEI Ming-te to discuss them with WANG Yong-ming.

Q: Based on the testimony of WEI Ming-te, he expressed that the Design Rule of their department was not proper when he, you and WANG Yong-ming discussed the Design Rule in the meeting room. Did you ever hear it from WEI Ming-te?

A: We had frequent meetings and discussions, so I had no impression on that statement.

Q: As far as you know, after WEI Ming-te had a discussion with WANG Yong-ming, was the Design Rule finalized?

A: No, the Design Rule hasn't been finalized yet.

Q: Which version of your company's Design Rule is it up to now?

A: I don't know about it.

Q: Did you know that the parameters handwritten by WANG Yong-ming at that time included the ion implantation data?

A: I don't know.

Q: When WANG Yong-ming was questioned by the investigator on 7 February 2017, he also confessed that "Then, I handed it over to him at the office of RONG Le-tien. No one else was there at that time. In my impression, I gave RONG Le-tien more than a dozen pages of the Design Rule of UMC; the Design Rule was supposed to be in the charge of PI2 (the manager was WEI Ming-te) of the new business division, but RONG Le-tien was my direct manager after all and I had to obey his instructions. WEI Ming-te, manager of PI2, can manifest the truth of my statement. After WEI Ming-te got the Design Rule (which should be handed over to him by RONG Le-tien. It was the same as the one I gave to RONG Le-tien at the earliest time), he directly asked me how to decide the other parameters (there were no other parameters in the original Design Rule of Micron, so I did not write this part for RONG Le-tien). So according to my judgment, RONG Le-tien told him that the Design Rule was provided by me, and WU Kuo-hao (a subordinate of WEI Ming-te) and another person (I forgot his name) also came to ask me how to set the parameters. I replied in the same way: 'Fill in the parameters of UMC if they are not available' and after that, they took care of it by themselves." What's your opinion on the confession of WANG Yong-ming?

A: It was quite possible that WANG Yong-ming delivered me the paper version of the Design Rule in my office, and I had no impression whether it contained more than ten pages. As I just stated, it was basically the Design Rule of UMC, with several handwritten items on it. Then I handed the several sheets of paper to WEI Ming-te and asked him to discuss it with WANG Yong-ming again. I didn't know what happened after that.

Q: During the investigator interrogation on 7 February 2017, WANG Yong-ming also confessed that "At that time, RONG Le-tien said that there was not much time left and hoped that I could provide it to him as soon as possible. He also said that it was impossible to know whether the Design Rule was correct or not because the F32 DMM of UMC had not been finished yet. However, Micron or Elpida has always had the product output of F32 DRAM, and the relevant values had been repeatedly verified and were pretty stable. So he hoped that if I had the Design Rule of Micron or Elpida at hand, I would pick out the different parts of the Design Rule of UMC and Micron or Elpida after mutual comparison, and fill in these stable values of Micron or Elpida, so that the Design Rule of F32 DRAM could be improved quickly by UMC, eliminating the time for debugging and adjustment. I couldn't remember how long it took me to give RONG Le-tien the revised Design Rule after he made requests. I merely remembered that I downloaded the Design Rule of Elpida and presented it to RONG Le-tien after about two to three days of adjustment." What's your opinion on the confession of WANG Yong-ming?

A: Our supervisor often reminded us that time was running out. As I stated above, I asked WANG Yong-ming what he thought of our Design Rule based on his experience in Micron. I didn't ask him to revise our Design Rule based on the Design Rule of Micron or Elpida. As for WANG Yong-ming's statement that the values of Elpida were stable, this was only my communication of the concepts with WANG Yong-ming. I told him that the Design Rule was in an evolving process, just as we have not really finalized the first version yet, and Elpida has more experience in 32- or 25-nanometer mass production, so their Design Rule should be comparatively stable. After WANG Yong-ming joined UMC, I knew that he had participated in the 25-nanometer mass production in Micron, so I might ask him to show his experience of 25-nanometer at this time, which should be helpful for the Design Rule we were going to formulate.

Q: I have the same question as the former prosecutor. With WANG Yong-ming's so-called experience, is it possible to revise the Design Rule of UMC and deliver it to you without referring to the Design Rule of other companies and coming up with the real feasible parameter values?

A: In fact, people in this industry will mostly rely on their accumulated knowledge and experience. For example, my specialty is integration and components, so I can also rely on my relevant experience during the discussion of related integration issues.

Q: Why didn't you indicate that the values WANG Yong-ming might provide were not conducive to the formulation of the Design Rule for UMC?

A: It is possible. Whether it is conducive or detrimental will not be defined until the developed process is relatively complete. The Design Rule may contain thousands of figures, which should be gradually finalized in the development process. The current version of UMC's Design Rule can only be available for the specific customers, including ULTRA MEMORY of Japan and ESMT of Taiwan. All staffs should work together to optimize the figures.

Q: When WANG Yong-ming was questioned by the investigator on 7 February 2017, he confessed that "RONG Le-tien is my manager. He asked me if I had some specifications and settings of Micron during discussions. He was the manager that interviewed me and he knew that I was from Micron. He hoped that I could provide some assistance to formulate the design specification of F32 DRAMS of UMC, so as to improve the specification." Do you have any comment on this?

A: For the last sentence, I believe I have said it before. I hope that every supervisor in my department can provide assistance. Like Takahiro Nagai, he also provided a lot of specific assistance. As for the first half of the above statement, that is, "RONG Le-tien asked me if I had some specifications and settings of Micron during discussions", there was no such thing.

Q: WANG Yong-ming also confessed to the prosecutor that "I think that the way to provide such data is basically inappropriate." What's your comment on this?

A: I didn't ask him to do that (that is, refer to the data of the former company)

Q: During the investigator interrogation on 8 February 2017, WANG Yong-ming confessed that "When the investigator came to search in the product office yesterday, RONG Le-tien told me and HO Chien-ting to move away anything about Micron" and said that "Since RONG Le-tien told me like this, he should know that I have some data of Micron at hand." Any comment on that?

A: I really don't know. At the moment I asked him if he had the relevant data and I was very surprised at his positive reply.

Q: On February 8, 2017, WANG Yong-ming also confessed that "At about 2:15 p.m. on February 7, 2017, RONG Le-tien called me to his office and I had no impression whether HO Chien-ting had followed me, but I knew that HO Chien-ting was also informed of the message at that time. RONG Le-tien told me to remove the data related to Micron as soon as possible. He meant my notebook computer. When I realized this, I took my notebook computer away, and I didn't think so much about it. HUANG Shu-han sat closer to me and I reached her seat to hand over my notebook computer and mobile phone." Any comment on that?

A: As I just said, I didn't know that WANG Yong-ming had delivered HUANG Shu-han his mobile phone and notebook computer until the next day. I didn't tell him to remove the data related to Micron. I remember what I said was that "Do you have data from your former company?" WANG Yong-ming replied that "There is no paper version, but there is some data in my computer." I was very surprised at his reply, as I just said.

Q: During the investigator interrogation on 14 February 2017, WANG Yong-ming confessed that "Before the investigators of your Office came for search on February 7 (2017), the assistant manager of RONG Le-tien only told me that the investigators would come for search and asked me to remove the data about Micron from the computer. But in my opinion, since it is required to remove the data about Micron from the computer, the paper version cannot be kept, so I handed over to HUANG Shu-han the items that record Micron's data, such as mobile phone, USB Flash Drive and notebook computer. In my impression, RONG Le-tien asked and personally instructed me to remove the data about Micron outside his office. What I can only confirm is that RONG Le-tien gave the same instructions to HO Chien-ting, but I don't remember whether I accepted the instructions from RONG Le-tien simultaneously or separately with HO Chien-ting, or whether HO Chien-ting gave the materials to HUANG Shu-han for storage." Any comment on that?

A: I have just reported the specific process twice and my reply is the same as above. At that time, the investigators would come in soon. I really can't remember whether I talked to HO Chien-ting or not, but our three seats were very close. I didn't know about the hand-over of items to HUANG Shu-han until the next day.

Q: During the investigator interrogation on 14 February 2017, WANG Yong-ming also confessed that "In July and August 2016 (I don't remember the exact time), I and WEI Ming-te were asked to stay to discuss the F32 DRAM Design Rule presented by WEI Ming-te at the end of a meeting at 9 a.m. (in the conference room opposite the office). At that time, the Design Rule was only a preliminary draft (PPT file) that had not yet been completed. And, UMC was mainly engaged in the operation of the logic IC OEM, and there was no relevant business base for DMM OEM at that time, so the preliminary draft did not include the three necessary categories of DRAM Design Rule, namely Cell, Array and Periphery. RONG Le-tien asked me to help complete these three parts of the Design Rule. To be specific, RONG Le-tien expressed to me that I would fill in the necessary parameters based on the data of Micron and my own thoughts and then submit it to RONG Le-tien for review. So I downloaded the finalized Design Rule (a word file, without Cell, Array and Periphery parts.) of the public version of Logic IC from the public data folder of the new business division (folder name: NBD or new business development), and I added Cell, Array and Periphery blocks on my own after printing it out, and filled in the parameters according to Micron's data, and then handed it over to RONG Le-tien. That's why Rong Letian knew that I had the relevant data of Micron on hand. As for RONG Le-tien's opinion that HO Chien-ting also had relevant data of Micron on hand, I personally judge that HO Chien-ting had put forward some specific data and practices related to Micron in relevant meetings, so RONG Le-tien would think that he also had relevant data about Micron." Any comment on that?

052

A: I cannot recall whether I have asked the 3 staffs to stay for discussion at the end of a meeting in the morning. But I remember that we had divided the Design Rule of F32 into three blocks: Cell, Array (smaller periphery) and Periphery (larger periphery). As for WANG Yong-ming's statement that "I would fill in the necessary parameters based on the data of Micron and my own thoughts", that was impossible in our company. CELL has an architecture called 3 x 2 or 2 x 3. The 3 x 2 architecture was adopted in the Korean system earlier. Micron adopted the 2 x 3 architecture up to the 20-nanometer CELL. A year ago, we decided that CELL should be provided with the architecture of Samsung and Hynix, so the Design Rule of Micron had no reference value for our 3 x 2 architecture, and CELL was compiled in a totally different way. As for the larger periphery, WEI Ming-te told me the 55- or 65-nanometer logical process of UMC, which was a relatively mature technique in UMC, so the Design Rule could directly follow the 65-nanometer process. As for the smaller periphery, the Design Rule was gradually finalized according to the multiple detailed discussions with the design company (this is the part where Takahiro Nagai had provided many valuable advice). As for WANG Yong-ming's statement that he filled in the parameters according to Micron's data, this was not in accordance with what I remembered. I didn't think that HO Chien-ting had the data of Micron. I was surprised to know about it on February 8.

Q: During the investigator interrogation on 14 February 2016, WANG Yong-ming confessed that "In July and August 2016, I provided relevant data of Micron as parameters of UMC's F32 DRAM Design Rule according to the instructions of RONG Le-tien, and only two months later, UMC submitted the Design Rule to ESMT to complete the chip design (i.e. the above-mentioned GDS), and provided the GDS to the tape-out manufacturer to produce the tape-out." What is your opinion on this statement of WANG Yong-ming?

A: The Design Rule was established by WEI Ming-te and etc. The Design Rule is constantly evolving and a new version may be formulated in two months, but it will not be the final version. We'd probably submitted one version to ESMT and I can't tell you exactly that this is the only version to be used in the design of ESMT. And this version was not completed by WANG Yong-ming independently. As for the statement that the data of Micron was provided under my instructions, I have replied many times that I did ask WANG Yong-ming for his advice. Until now I knew that WANG Yong-ming went home and downloaded the data of Micron after I asked for his advice.

Q: Are you the owner of the house at your place of domicile?

A: No, it's the dormitory of the Park Administration.

Q: Have you ever been abroad last year and this year?

A: Yes.

Q: Do you have an account at a financial institution in mainland China?

A: No. In the members of the R&D team, some of them were from UMC and some of them were recruited from society. The base salary is relatively low in the salary structure of UMC. If UMC wants to compete with other companies, it should rely on bonuses and dividends to attract talents. It's very difficult for UMC to attract talents from other companies by relying solely on its base salary. So later, a system was designed where staffs with high base salaries would not be given bonuses or dividends. Take myself for example, my base salary is not high, so I will be given bonuses and dividends. So JHICC provided another cash bonus because of this difference.

Q: Is there any other evidence to be investigated by the prosecutor?

A: Not yet.

The defenders were questioned as follows:

Q: Do you have any other opinions or statements?

Lawyer CHEN Che-Hung replied: There is no evidence to be investigated by my side. I just hope that the defendant can take a break early.

The procurator called a short recess for 10 minutes (8.33 p.m.).

The trial resumed (8.40 p.m.).

The defendant was questioned as follows:

Q: Do you have any other opinions or statements?

054

A: The base salary is relatively low in the salary structure of UMC's new business division. Like me, staffs that are transferred from within UMC have a lower base salary and will be given bonuses and dividends. Staffs recruited from outside will have a higher base salary, and there will be no bonus or dividend from UMC. So because of this difference, JHICC provided another cash bonus for those staffs without bonus or dividend.

The defendant is suspected of such crimes as Paragraph 1.1.4 of Article 13 of the Trade Secrets Act or Article 13 (2) of the Trade Secrets Act, and is suspected of annihilating evidences, and is financially sound as a senior manager, he is ordered to pay NT\$150,000 and is barred from leaving the country, so as to ensure the follow-up investigation. The detention is not required. If the person liable to penalty disagrees with the punishment of the prosecutor, he or she may, within 5 days from the date of punishment, appeal to the court of his or her jurisdiction to revoke or change it.

9.9 p.m. on February 15, 2017, Republic of China

It is confirmed that this record is true and correct, and is signed as below

Defendant: RONG Le-tien

Defender: Lawyer LIU Chia-Kun

Defender: Lawyer CHEN Che-Hung

Clerk: YEN Chun Hsiu

Prosecutor: CHEN Li-Wei

055



**D-0000381**